

Docket No. 30990089-3 US (1509-132)
USSN 09/726,395

REMARKS

Applicants note the allowance of claims 1, 3-17, 19, 20, 22, 23 and 30-44 and the indication of claims 25-29 containing allowable subject matter.

Claims 2, 18 and 21 have been amended to overcome the rejection based on 35 USC§112, second paragraph, and claim 24 has been amended to overcome the obviousness rejection based on Pelsue et al. (U.S. Patent 6,633,338).

The amendment to claim 24 does not raise new issues or require a new search and because the Office Action impliedly suggests the amendment. The Office Action says claim 24 has "no requirements for the first and second image sensing regions to be different." Thus, the Examiner previously considered this limitation and has implied it avoids the prior art. While Applicants believe the Examiner's interpretation of first and second sensing regions is overly broad and would not be sustained on appeal, the amendment has been made to expedite prosecution.

Claim 24, as previously presented and as now amended, requires first and second imaging regions. The Office Action indicates these regions were interpreted as being the same, which is what Pelsue et al. discloses. While Applicants believe this interpretation was incorrect, it is no longer possible. By using first and second image sensing regions, i.e., first and second different image sensing regions, Applicants achieve advantageous results over Pelsue et al. For example, with Applicants' method of claim 24, objects can be more quickly imaged than in the Pelsue et al. single imaging arrangement.

Docket No. 30990089-3 US (1509-132)
USSN 09/726,395

Applicants cannot agree with the conclusion in the Office Action that combining the images of the Pelsue et al. arrangement is obvious. Since the Pelsue et al. images are of the same image sensing region, there is no reason why one of ordinary skill would have combined them.

Allowance is in order.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 08-2025 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

David Neil SLATTER

Kenneth M. Berner

FOR By: KENNETH M. BERNER #37,093

Allan M. Lowe
Reg. No. 19,641

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
703-684-1111 telephone
970-898-0640 telecopier
AML:alw

M:\1509 Hewlett-Packard Company\1509-132\Amend 01-26-05 FOA.doc